

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 and 14-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1-11 and 14-24 have been rejected. By this Amendment, the Applicant amends claims 1-11. No new matter has been added.

At paragraph 2, the Examiner rejects claims 1-11 and 14-24 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner states that the claims are not directed towards a final result that is useful, tangible and concrete. The Applicant traverses the rejections, but amends claim 1 to expedite prosecution.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of retrieving data from a file storage system. As the Examiner requests, claim 1 as amended recites a practical application (i.e., retrieving data from a file storage system) and a final result which is concrete, useful and tangible (i.e., the data that is retrieved in response to the search criteria). Use of this method results in data extracted from a file storage system, based on search criteria associated with the data through the keyword. Thus, the rejection of claim 1, as amended, under 35 U.S.C. 101 should be withdrawn. Since claims 2-13 depend from allowable claim 1, those rejections should also be withdrawn.

Independent claim 14 recites a method of searching for data from a file storage system. Searching for data in a file storage system is a practical application. Claim 14 further recites “presenting results from the comparing step.” The comparison results presented are a useful, tangible and concrete result. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claim 14 is improper and should be withdrawn. Since claims 15-24 depend from allowable claim 14, the rejections of those claims should also be withdrawn.

At paragraph 3, the Examiner rejects claims 1-11 and 14-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,356,897 (Gusack) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,802 (Kessenich). The Applicant traverses these rejections. Claim 1, as amended, recites a keyword with a first portion and a second portion. The first portion is a parameter, and the second portion is a parameter value that is associated with the parameter. This association between the two portions of the keyword is an important aspect of the claimed method, and is simply not taught or suggested in Gusack or Kessenich, alone or in combination. As disclosed throughout the specification, the combination of a parameter with a parameter value provides for more flexible searching as compared to a parameter or keyword alone.

As the Examiner points out, Gusack at Fig. 15 and col. 19, lines 28-59 describes words highlighted in a text field, which are listed with L# fields in a hypertext word index. In the example provided in Fig. 15, the highlighted word is “QUALITY.” However, Gusack does not teach or suggest associating a parameter value to this highlighted word, as claims 1 and 14 recite. The L# field merely points to a particular records in the text data table, but has no parameter value aspect, as is required by the claims. As the Examiner points out, Gusack does not explicitly teach a parameter value. More specifically, Gusack does not explicitly teach a parameter value associated with the parameter.

Kessenich does not supply that which is missing from Gusack. The Examiner points to col. 13, lines 2-33 of Kessenich as describing a parameter value. However, a careful reading of this text reveals that Kessenich is concerned with search parameters (e.g., col. 13, line 10) and how they relate to text documents stored in a database. A search of Kessenich, even beyond the text cited by the Examiner, failed to find any teaching of a parameter value. Thus, Kessenich does not teach or suggest a parameter value, nor does Kessenich teach or suggest any combination of a parameter and parameter value to form a keyword, as claim 1 requires. Further, no combination of Gusack and Kessenich teaches or suggests a keyword as a combination of a parameter and a parameter value.

Neither Gusack nor Kessinich, nor any combination of these references teaches or suggests the limitation of a keyword that includes a parameter and an associated parameter value, as required by claim 1. The Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. Similarly, independent claim 14 recites a keyword that includes a parameter and an associated parameter value, so that rejection should be withdrawn

Filed herewith is a Request for a Three-Month Extension of Time, which extends the statutory period for response to expire on January 12, 2007. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

Application No. 10/672,943  
Amendment dated January 8, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 12, 2006

Docket No.: 0109204.133US2

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. No other fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response, however the Commissioner is authorized to debit Deposit Account No. 08-0219 for any required fee necessary to maintain the pendency of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: JANUARY 8, 2007



Ronald R. Demsher  
Registration No.: 42,478  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109  
(617) 526-6000 (telephone)  
(617) 526-5000 (facsimile)